

**UNIVERSITY OF HULL
UNIVERSITY OF YORK**

HULL YORK MEDICAL SCHOOL

JOINT SENATE COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 24th October 2018

PART A: UNRESERVED BUSINESS

18-19/01 APOLOGIES AND ATTENDANCE

For a list of attendees and apologies, please see Annex A.

The Chair welcomed the Committee, including new members, and received apologies for absence.

18-19/02 MINUTES 25th July 2018

The minutes of the meeting held on 25th July 2018 (enclosure HJSC.18-19.01) were reviewed and **approved** as a true and accurate record of the meeting

18-19/03 MATTERS ARISING

The Committee **received** a list of matters arising (HJSC.18-19.02). It was **noted** that:

- a) Re M17-18/40b.v – The Joint Board supported the progression of discussions between HYMS and South Tees Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, overseen by HJSC, and additionally that the Dean intended to discuss the partnership at the Joint Board in December 2018.
- b) Re M17-18/44 – The Secretary contacted the Governance Officers of both Universities regarding who should ultimately approve decisions taken as part of the fitness-to-study process to suspend or expel a student. It was reported that both Universities would expect that the decision should be taken by the Vice Chancellor of the university with which the student is registered, on the recommendation of the HJSC. However, this view has yet to be confirmed definitively and discussions are ongoing to resolve this issue. This may also have implications for the management of appeals of fitness-to-study decisions. HJSC will be kept informed of the outcome of the discussions and of further actions on the Committee.
- c) Re M17-18/46 – The Secretary has confirmed that York will manage HYMS' participation in the National Student Survey and Postgraduate Research Experience Survey, but that Hull is yet to confirm it will participate in the Postgraduate Taught Experience Survey and thus be in a position to manage HYMS' participation. The Secretary will continue to liaise with Hull with regard to PTES.

18-19/04 TO RECEIVE FOR INFORMATION A LIST OF CHAIR'S ACTIONS SINCE THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The Committee **received** a list of Chair's Action approvals (HJSC.18-19.03) since the last meeting. The Chair **approved**:

- a) Revisions to the *Policy on Exceptional Circumstances* made following HJSC to account for feedback provided by the Committee.
- b) A final version of the *Code of Practice on Fitness to Study* following revisions to the document made on the recommendation of the last HJSC meeting.
- c) An updated version of the *Policy on Leave of Absence* at the request of the Board of Studies.
- d) An updated version of the *Policy on Student Welfare and Support* at the request of the Board of Studies.

18-19/05 TO APPROVE THE MEMBERSHIP, ANNUAL CYCLE OF BUSINESS AND TO REVIEW THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE COMMITTEE

The Committee **considered** the Terms of Reference, membership and annual cycle of business (HJSC.18-19.04). It **considered** minor revisions to the wording of Term of Reference 10 and Term of Reference 15 to add fitness-to-study to Term 10 and to update the titles of Hull committees in Term 15.

During the discussion of the membership it was **noted**, in response to comments received by the Secretary from the HUU President of Education about student representation on the Committee, that HJSC is a committee of the Universities and that students' union representatives are members reflecting their roles as representatives of the collective student interests at the respective universities, and not of the HYMS students.

The Committee **approved** the proposal that the MBBS Programme Director be added to the membership in an in-attendance capacity. The Secretary will inform the MBBS Programme Director and invite him to future meetings.

Action: Secretary

It was **noted** that HJSC does not have a quorum and it was felt that the introduction of such provision could help to ensure that business is approved following balanced input of the Universities and of student representatives. The Chair agreed to discuss introducing a quorum with the Deputy Chair.

Action: Chair of HJSC

The Committee **approved** the revised membership and annual cycle of business. It also **recommended** that the suggested revisions to the Terms of Reference be put to the Joint Board for its approval.

Action: Secretary

18-19/06 TO RECEIVE AN ORAL REPORT FROM THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

The YUSU Academic Officer **reported** on their recent work to elect and train Course Representatives and of the specific work in liaison with HUU to support Course Rep training and links with HYMS. A joint training session would be held in Hull in the following days. Additionally, YUSU were now actively seeking to recruit a new Department Rep from HYMS. The Academic Officer also invited HYMS to take part in a pilot project to work with departments to see how students can be more actively involved in curriculum development.

The GSA President **reported** that the GSA is working with YUSU to enhance the activities of Course Reps and that they too aim to liaise with HUU to achieve these enhancements.

The Acting Chair of the Staff-Student Committee **reported** that HYMS had seen its most effective round of Course Rep elections with 33 posts filled. However, it was proving more challenging to engage postgraduate research students. The Acting Chair also **noted** that he was no longer the HUU School Representative and that elections to that position would be held.

18-18/07 TO DISCUSS A WRITTEN REPORT FROM THE DEAN

a) The Dean introduced her report (HJSC.18-19.05) and drew the Committee's attention to:

- i. The overview of the staff profile supplied at the Committee's request;
- ii. The outcome of the recruitment cycle for entry in 2018-19 and the early activities underway for recruitment for 2019-20 entry;
- iii. The work underway to implement the expansion of the MBBS programme;
- iv. The business systems developments underway and planned to respond both to current needs and to facilitate the expansion;
- v. The summary of the National Student Survey results and internal analysis of them, which was returned to later in the meeting (see M18-19/12).

b) During the discussion it was **noted** that:

- i. A number of posts have been offered and notices of appointment are pending the completion of HR processes, with other posts to be advertised shortly. Future recruitment would also be focused on enhancing the MBBS programme and student experience, with University senior managers supportive of this approach.
- ii. The MBBS cohort in 2018-19 is the first expanded cohort, with 25 additional home students. The campus allocation is greater at Hull where there has been more capacity to accommodate the additional numbers at present, but the aim is to rebalance the allocation in 2019-20.
- iii. The application window for MBBS entry for 2019-20 has now closed with the largest number of applicants on record and a large number of applications for the MBBS with a Gateway Year variant. Additionally, the School expect the expansion to present some unpredictability in making and converting offers. However, they will closely monitor the

management of the recruitment process from this point, including ensuring there are sufficient staff to undertake applicant interviews without compromising programme delivery and the current student experience.

- iv. Postgraduate taught recruitment has increased overall, though reductions to funding for have resulted in a slight fall in registrations for the MSc in Physician Associate Studies.
- v. Work to prepare for and implement the expansion is progressing well, with a number of working groups focusing on specific aspects. This work includes strengthening relationships with NHS partners to ensure that senior trust staff understood plans, their role within them and they support enhancements to placement provision. The current round of statutory monitoring visits by HYMS at the NHS Trusts were providing valuable forums for discussion with positive buy-in. Partners were also enthusiastic about offering additional placement opportunities, partly motivated by a desire to demonstrate their attractiveness as an employer to encourage graduates to remain in the under-doctored HYMS region. Developments to partner with South Tees Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust were also part of the effort to ensure a sufficient supply of quality placements.
- vi. Systems work to both upgrade existing dated systems and to future-proof for the expansion was focussed on the assessment and management information systems.
- vii. Estates developments have been a recent focus, with a particular need to address the current high risk presented by the inadequacy of the York HYMS building and of video-linked lecture theatre facilities. The aim was to ensure that the student experience was equitable at both Universities, particularly with regard to the provision of collaborative learning spaces which HYMS perceive to be below par at York. The Dean is in discussion with senior York colleagues to agree a solution to the School's infrastructure needs.
- viii. The MBBS expansion was intended to stimulate an expanded intercalated programme offer, with more students undertaking more intercalated degrees at HYMS and the Universities. The MSc in Pharmacology and Drug Development (M18-19/08 refers) being one example of intentions to grow the offer, but with other initiatives being considered to highlight the attractiveness of provision such as in Biomedical Science programmes.

18-19/08 TO CONSIDER A NEW PROGRAMME PROPOSAL FOR MSc IN PHARMACOLOGY AND DRUG DEVELOPMENT

- a) The Committee **considered** a proposal for a postgraduate taught MSc in Pharmacology and Drug Development (HJSC.18-19.06a-j) to begin in September 2019. This programme would be advertised as a full-time programme, with the Committee also asked to approve a part-time route that could be offered as an unadvertised contingency route to students that may register for the full-time programme but then be unable to continue studying full-time. The proposal included a Postgraduate Certificate in Pharmacology and Drug Development lower award for students successfully completing at least 60 credits. Dr Roger Sturmey and Dr Simon Calaminus, programme proposers, attended to speak to the proposal.

- b) The Committee noted that:
- i. The programme would be marketed to graduates of Biomedical Sciences, Pharmacology and related subjects and to MBBS students wishing to intercalate;
 - ii. The programme would be delivered in Hull only;
 - iii. The programme would consist of five new 20 credit modules and the revised existing 80 credit Research Project/ Dissertation Independent Study Module used by the MSc in Human Anatomy and Evolution also presented as part of the proposal;
 - iv. The programme would help to expand the postgraduate taught offer at the University of Hull and draw on capacity that has recently become available within HYMS to deliver such a programme;
 - v. The design of the programme would complement but also offer something different to existing Pharmacology programmes in the sector by offering a unique blend of practical, trials-related content with wider theory and subject knowledge relevant to those wanting to specialise in the field in research or commercial careers;
 - vi. The proposers had been in discussions with the pharmaceutical company RB who were keen to be involved in the programme, but that at this stage the nature of involvement was to be confirmed and expected to include guest lectures, advice on content, work placement or internship opportunities;
 - vii. The programme had been approved by Postgraduate Programmes Board, Board of Studies, had received external assessor comments, and thorough feedback from the York Quality Support Officer for which the proposers were grateful;
 - viii. The programme was being considered subject to receiving planning approval from both York and Hull in early November.
- c) During consideration of the proposal the Committee discussed:
- i. Whether the part-time route proposed would be feasible for students to undertake on a fractional basis given the expectation those opting for such a route would likely be in employment also. However, it was also thought that it might be valuable to advertise a suitably structured part-time route that could attract those working in industry wishing to upskill. The proposers offered to reconsider the structure of the part-time route and circumstances under which it might be offered.
 - ii. The degree of synergy between the programme learning outcomes and some module aims, learning outcomes and indicative content outlined in the module descriptors. For example, it was suggested that:
 - Bench to Bedside II did not present a suitable offer towards the indicated programme learning outcomes and that the module might be attempting to include too much and too diverse content in 20 credits;
 - Foundations of Pharmacology aims and content do not appear to match in terms of topics such as Pharmacodynamics.

It was acknowledged that for Foundations the descriptor could more explicitly link the aims and outcomes to the indicative content. For Bench to Bedside II it would be useful for the module lead to review the descriptor and consider where amendments might

provide a more suitable balance to accurately represent the extent to which graduates would be skilled in Randomised Control Trial practices.

- iii. The challenge that can be presented to students if modules combine theory and practice and that this balance could be reconsidered across the modules, which the proposers would discuss further with module leads.
 - iv. The volume of assessment appeared heavy, was more than required to adequately assess module learning outcomes and that particularly for any part-time students in employment this workload might impact on the student experience. It was explained that the aim was to provide varied assessment throughout modules rather than single tasks in a concentrated time period, but that this balance could be reviewed whilst avoiding a reduction in rigour of a master's programme and expectation that students will be able to manage their time well.
 - v. The appropriateness of reassessment tasks being different to original tasks and given the requirement that all assessment tasks were passed, without compensation being available at module level. It was explained that having different reassessment tasks was appropriate as module learning outcomes would still be assessed and that having different reassessment tasks to the original would be more practical to deliver.
 - vi. The comparability of assessment requirements in the context of their weighting in the overall module assessment, for example different word limits on tasks in different modules. It was explained that these differences were justified by the different skills involved in completing different tasks, for example the challenge of writing comprehensive, concise risk assessments compared with a prose essay.
 - vii. The programme did not appear to focus on the patient perspective or have public patient involvement (PPI) in its development, which given the research sector's drive to greater patient inclusion, it could be appropriate for the curriculum to highlight to researchers of the future. It was acknowledged that patient perspectives could be given greater consideration as modules are developed to appropriate enhancements.
- d) Following the discussions it was **agreed** that the programme had merit and that the full-time route only be approved subject to a number of conditions. It was also **noted** that as the programme still required planning approvals it could not be advertised until these approvals were received. To meet the conditions below the Secretary would forward an addendum of points, including comments to be provided by Dr B Lee who needed to leave before the proposal was discussed. Further, Professor Lightfoot offered to discuss the programme with the proposers to share experience from the York Department of Health Sciences.
- e) The Committee's academic approval of the proposal was subject to:
- i. Addressing satisfactorily the points provided by the Secretary in the addendum;
 - ii. Addressing the concerns about the synergy of programme learning outcomes and module outcomes, aims and indicative content;
 - iii. Confirmation of the tasks and timings of module assessments and reassessments.

Action: Secretary

- f) In addition, the proposers were asked to confirm the intended part-time structure of the programme and the circumstances by which the part-time route would be offered, following which the Committee could consider approving the part-time route. It was recommended that the proposers also consider carefully the other feedback received and how it might enhance the final programme specification and module descriptors for final sign-off by Chair's Action.

Action: Chair of BoS

18-19/09 TO RECEIVE THE ANNUAL TRACKER OF MINOR AMENDMENTS TO CODES AND POLICIES

The Committee **received** the annual tracker of minor amendments to Codes and Policies (HJSC.18-19.07) that were made without requiring Committee or Chair approval (M13-14/36 refers).

18-19/10 TO DISCUSS THE PROPOSED PROCESS FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF TAUGHT (INCLUDING POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH) COLLABORATIVE PROVISION IN HYMS AND OF WORK-BASED LEARNING PLACEMENTS TO BE MANAGED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF YORK ON BEHALF OF BOTH UNIVERSITIES (M17-18/40.b.v REFERS)

The Committee **discussed** a proposal (HJSC.18-19.08) prepared and introduced by the Secretary to determine how the Universities manage collaboration proposals between HYMS and external partners, and particularly as they apply to teaching and learning activities rather than other forms of partnership (such as research or facilitating faculty capacity building). The Committee was informed that following what was understood to have been decided by the Joint Board in October 2017 (M8 refers), which was that York should manage such proposals on behalf of the Universities to ensure appropriate due diligence and sign-off of initiatives, Global Engagement had been working on a framework for considering different sorts of proposals, liaising with the Academic Support Office whose focus has been on teaching and learning partnerships.

The Secretary's proposal sought to include a framework for collaborations with UK as well as international partners and cited the current discussion with South Tees NHS Hospitals Foundation Trust. The paper suggested that proposals for collaboration involving co-delivery and award of programmes adopted York's *Procedure for the Approval of Collaborative Provision Involving Taught Programmes of Study and Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes*, with amendments (included in the paper) to account for HYMS' unique context, academic governance structures and of the need to ensure the effective consultation with both Universities. Where partnerships were to be for the sole purpose of providing placements to HYMS students it was proposed these followed the *York Policy Statement on Work-Based Learning and Placements*. The intention behind this course of action was to provide proportionate due diligence to enable HYMS to work with new partners.

During the discussion, the Dean expressed her view that it was only international issues that the Joint Board had directed that York manage on behalf of both universities, without a need for such

robust practices to provide assurance of the appropriateness of UK-based partners. It was also felt that the School was experienced at developing partnerships with NHS organisations and that the 'business as usual' nature of such relationships was not recognised by the proposal. Additionally, it was felt that the proposals did not account for the dynamic nature of NHS organisational changes.

The Dean suggested that the HYMS Management Board and Board of Studies discuss a revised proposal with further consideration at the next HJSC. The Chair accepted this suggestion. Paper HJSC.18-19/08 was therefore tabled and the Chair and Secretary would discuss the issue further with all parties.

Action: Chair and Secretary

Secretary's note: Following the HJSC meeting, the Chair suggested that the HYMS Management Board and Board of Studies consider the following four questions before further discussion at the next HJSC meeting:

1. Should international teaching and learning collaboration proposals follow the *York Procedure for the Approval of Collaborative Provision Involving Taught Programmes of Study and Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes*, amended to account for HYMS governance structures?
- 2.a) If the answer to 1 is yes, should this approach also apply to UK-based partnership proposals? b) If not, what alternative is proposed?
3. It is appropriate that the expectations, rights and responsibilities concerning student participation in work-based learning/ placement activities are appropriately considered and documented. Does the School have its own such process in place covering this issue, and if not, could it use the *York Policy Statement on Work-Based Learning and Placements* adapted to fit its needs?
- 4.a) Given the School's decisions in relation to 1-3 above, are there any gaps in providing the due diligence of collaborative partnerships for the provision of teaching and learning, and if so, b) how does the School propose addressing these?

18-19/11 TO DISCUSS THE ANNUAL (VERBAL) REPORT BY THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD OF STUDIES ON THE WORK OF THE BOARD DURING 2017-18 (M17-18/05 REFERS)

The Chair of the Board of Studies provided a verbal report on the Board's activities in 2017-18. The Chair informed the Committee that 2017-18 had been a busy year with approvals of the Gateway and Pharmacology programmes and a range of minor to significant regulatory reforms. The major revisions to regulations and new policies introduced included an overhauled Exceptional Circumstances policy introducing a fit-to-sit policy for clinical assessments, as well as a new policy on Fitness-to-Study. The Board was continuing to implement measures to ensure the changes to Exceptional Circumstances were being effectively communicated to and understood by the student body.

The Chair also explained that the Board had gained approval for students from the University of Kurdistan Hewler (UKH) registered on the Diploma in HE (Medical Sciences) to progress to the

MBBS programme, but that the Diploma in HE would be discontinued as an entry route as the relationship with UKH was being dissolved.

The Chair explained the School's commitment to Patient Public Involvement (PPI) in its academic provision and that patient representatives have been members of the Board of Studies. However, this position was under review as it was not felt the Board was the most appropriate forum for PPI given its varied and often complex business. The School is therefore considering how best to enhance PPI where it could be most effective, potentially on MBBS and Physician Associate Studies committees.

The Chair explained that the Board of Studies has continued to explore ways in which to enhance student engagement and it was felt by the Chair, supported by the Acting Chair of Student Staff Committee, that this had been an area of improvement, with a greater level of engagement and more professional training for Course Reps. The Board's concern was now to explore how to engage postgraduate research students who had been particularly hard to reach, despite the efforts of the previous Chair of Postgraduate Programmes Board.

The Chair explained that the management of appeals and fitness-to-practise cases has been reviewed to ensure that issues of academic performance and academic judgement are kept separate from fitness-to-practise concerns, but that the bodies with responsibility for the respective concerns are suitably informed of contextual information and receive feedback on cases to enable them to improve case management and identify any trends.

The Chair of HJSC thanked the Chair of BoS for his report and asked that a concise written report to aid members' absorption of the Board's activities be submitted in the future.

Action: Chair of BoS

18-19/12 TO DISCUSS THE NATIONAL STUDENT SURVEY RESULTS AND PROPOSED ACTIONS

The Committee **discussed** the National Student Survey (NSS) 2018 results for HYMS (HJSC.18-19.09a-c as well as the final update on the 2017-18 MBBS action plan (HJSC.18-19.09d). The MBBS Programme Director attended to speak to the item, which was introduced by the Chair of BoS. The Chair of BoS explained that the results were consistent with 2017 and were disappointing. The Action Plan for 2018-19, to be developed but summarised in HJSC.18-19.09a, was to build on the work in progress to address long-standing issues.

The Chair of HJSC endorsed this approach, as indicated in the University York's NSS report, and **noted** that the 2018 actions were also slightly broader in scope. The Committee **discussed** the pivotal role of Clinical Deans as staff able to connect University-based learning with clinically-based learning, to be a visible HYMS presence to students on placements and to highlight and resolve placement-based issues. It was **noted** that it is only relatively recently that there has been a full MBBS staff team able to engage with the delivery issues and to provide the leadership required to instigate and maintain improvements.

It was also **noted** that NSS provides respondents with an opportunity to reflect and comment upon a five year programme and that some issues referred to in open comments were or had

been addressed, or required longer-term solutions that would feed through the survey in the coming years. It was also **noted** that two recent events affecting year five students may negatively impact on NSS 2019 responses, though the School had proactively and promptly sought to address the problems. Both of these issues relate to Organisation and Management which would continue to be a focal point for programme enhancements.

The MBBS Programme Director informed the Committee that he was personally visiting all placement students and using the visits to garner feedback and then to update students on how their concerns had been addressed. This strategy was commended. It was felt that there was value in a broader, more collective approach to advertising a 'you said we did' response to student feedback, but that the face-to-face personal one could be particularly effective.

The role of block feedback surveys and focus groups for identifying any concerns with the student experience was **discussed**. These were felt to be a useful indicator of dissatisfaction, providing valuable data with which to discuss placement provision with NHS partners. The MBBS Programme Director **reported** that he has begun to survey students using the broad themes of the NSS to aid the School's early awareness of student perceptions. It was hoped that the combination of approaches with the increasingly positive staff-student relationships would stimulate improvements across the NSS dimensions.

The Chair of HJSC explained the York approach to providing senior teaching and learning leadership support to departments with challenging NSS results and offered to again support HYMS in this way. The Committee **agreed** that the Chair should work with the School to develop its 2018-19 action plan.

Action: Chair of HJSC

18-19/13 TO RECEIVE THE ANNUAL REPORT ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT IN HYMS

The Committee **received** a verbal update on cases of academic misconduct in HYMS from the Head of Quality and Standards, reporting that five cases had been dealt with in 2017-18 up from one in 2016-17.

18-19/14 TO DISCUSS THE SCHOOL'S PARTICIPATION IN THE FORTHCOMING TEF SUBJECT-LEVEL PILOT AS PART OF BOTH UNIVERSITIES' PARTICIPATION

The Chair **reported** that York had been successful in its application to take part in the TEF Subject-level pilot in autumn-spring 2018-19, subject to formal confirmation by the Office for Students of the final list of selected institutions. The University of Hull had also applied to take part, though it was not known if the application had been successful. The Chair expressed his desire for HYMS to be included in the pilot.

The Committee **noted** that in 2017-18 HEFCE had exempted HYMS' participation in Hull's submission due to the complexity of submitting data for students registered with their respective university. This was an issue challenging other joint medical schools and the Medical Schools

Council was exploring solutions. The Chair resolved to discuss a way forward with the Deputy Chair and to keep the Dean and Head of Quality and Standards informed of the discussions.

Action: Chair of HJSC

18-19/15 DATES OF MEETINGS IN 2018-19

Dates of remaining meetings for 2018-19

- **Thursday** 24th January 2019, 10.00am-12pm, Meeting Room 223 HYMS York/ 1st floor meeting room Loxley Building Hull
- **Wednesday** 17th April 2019, 2.00-4.00pm, Meeting Room 223 HYMS York/ **2nd floor** meeting room Loxley Building Hull
- **Thursday** 25th July 2019 10.00am-12.00pm, Meeting Room 223 HYMS York/ 1st floor meeting room Loxley Building Hull

ANNEX A: Attendance

Members

Professor John Robinson (Chair, PVC York)

Professor Una Macleod (Dean, HYMS)

Dr Sam Cobb (Chair Board of Studies, HYMS) – from M18-19/07

Professor Neil Lunt (York Senate representative) – left during M18-19/12

Mr James Hare (Academic Officer, YUSU)*

Mr Vassili Crispi (Acting Chair Student Staff Committee, HYMS)*

Dr Sarah-Louise Jones (Senate, Hull)

Mr Colin Johnson (Teaching Committee, Hull)

Dr Colette Conroy (Teaching Committee, Hull)

Dr Barry Lee (Teaching Committee, York) – left during M18-19/07

Professor Tracy Lightfoot (Teaching Committee, York)

Professor Stephen Smith (Senate, York)

Professor Neil Lunt (Senate, York)

In attendance:

Dr Adrian Lee (Secretary, York)

Mrs Alison Pettigrew (Head of Quality and Standards, HYMS)

Mr Nigel Dandy (Head of Academic Support Office, York)

Ms Lynne Braham (Deputy Director Academic Partnerships, Hull)

Mr John Busby (Chief Operating Officer, HYMS)

Professor Brian Fulton (Dean of Faculty – Sciences, York) – left during M18-19/11

Dr Roger Sturmeay } (Proposers, MSc in Pharmacology, HYMS) – for item M18-19/08

Dr Simon Calaminus }

Professor Martin Veysey (MBBS Programme Director, HYMS) – for item M18-19/12

Apologies

Professor Glenn Burgess (Acting Deputy Chair, DVC Hull)

Mrs Lisa Tees (Academic Quality Manager, Hull)

Ms Charlotte Chamberlain (Vice President Academic, Graduate Students' Association)*

Professor Julie Jomeen (Dean of Faculty of Health Sciences, Hull)

Miss Isobel Hall (President Education, HUU)*

Ms Osaro Otobo (President of the Union, HUU)*

Dr Julie Seymour (Chair of Postgraduate Programmes Board, HYMS)

Members marked with a * do not attend for reserved business.

ADDENDUM TO 18-19/08 TO CONSIDER A NEW PROGRAMME PROPOSAL FOR MSc IN PHARMACOLOGY AND DRUG DEVELOPMENT

(This addendum includes feedback received from Dr Barry Lee after the meeting due to his need to leave the meeting before the proposal was discussed).

Conditions of Approval

1. The programme will use the HYMS 3 term structure (4 x 10 week units). For the autumn term there are currently 11 weeks of planned teaching. The proposers are asked to confirm this is the case and that they wish the programme to start one week earlier than the usual HYMS postgraduate year. (The implications of this for such as Tier iv, accommodation, student records should be checked with appropriate offices at Hull and York).
2. Related to 1, the proposers are asked to ensure that in representing the preferred part-time structure that it is clear in year 2 Bench to Bedside I will run for weeks 5-11 only and not be term-long.
3. Section 10 of the programme specification should give the grade of BSc needed to enter the programme. (It is usual that this be a minimum 2i classification, as for example, for MSc HAE and Physician Associate).
4. The part-time structure differs from MSc HAE which will share the Research Project/ Dissertation module, and in that the ISM is spread whole year 2 on the HAE programme. The module specification needs amending and/or Pharmacology part-time year 2 needs thought to ensure the module can be used on both programmes.
5. Section 15 PLO c.i seems to have a typo that should be addressed: "Formulate research questions to design and carry out an independent original research project examining an aspect of pharmacology". Should the "to" be "and"? (The aim appears to be that students are also able to design and to execute projects).
6. Section 15.b Learning outcomes and 19 Assessment map – assessment comment on box 15.b for LO B(i) lists a range of methods of assessment, but in 19a only the dissertation module (with thesis and presentation) is listed as assessing B(i). This is supported by the content of Table A. 15b, 19, Table A to be reviewed and amended as appropriate (see also below re Research Skills, Therapeutics).
7. Section 19a – Programme Assessment Mapping: outcomes for Practical Research Skills in Pharmacology are framed as continuations of 'Students will have' rather than as continuations of 'Students will be able to' (as other module outcomes are). The outcomes should all be stated as continuations of 'Students will be able to'.
8. Section 19a – The statement of Programme Outcome a.i for several modules is "Outline the fundamental theories and concepts within pharmacology and can apply those to different settings and drug classes". This appears inconsistent with the original statement of a.i (section 15.a) and should be cross-checked and corrected.
9. Section 20 reference to 'Advanced Topics for Clinical Pharmacology' to be updated to reflect the final module titles proposed.
10. Table A: Programme Curriculum Map (p.12) and linked to section 19.a – There are 4 cases in which one module bears the full burden for a PLO. If it is the case that there are modules which provide advanced work (perhaps not summative assessment) relevant to the PLOs concerned, these should be recorded here. (Though this makes the table 'less clean', it might help students to see and be assured about how the programme fits together and builds skills and abilities).

Foundations Module

11. p.6 – Assessment timings should be more clearly expressed – closed book exam formative ‘week 4’, critical review essay ‘week 8’, re-submission of essay ‘4 weeks’ not ‘*within 4 weeks*’, so students will know in which week exactly assessment will be undertaken and for accurate inclusion in SITS programme records.
12. The programme specification assessment table lists MCQ test. If this will be the formative exam format it should be indicated in the module descriptor assessment table.

Research Skills

13. (See also 7 above).
14. Learning outcome 2 should be checked so it matches the reference to the outcome in Programme Spec, p7.
15. Assessment timings need to be more precise. Deadlines need to be to the week of *term* (not *semester*). Resubmission timings also need to be clearer and precise to the week.
16. Feedback timings should be clear and appropriate to when assessments are submitted.

Bench to Bedside I

17. The programme is to stand-alone, without relying on an industrial partner, but the module descriptor (sec. 12) states ‘receive input from members of the pharmaceutical industry’. Discussions are ongoing as to the nature of this and so the module descriptor should hedge references to the partner more and to avoid any misleading assertion being made.
18. Section 21 – Learning outcome 5 (and programme specification) have the wrong spelling of principles for 3Rs re animal testing which should be corrected.
19. Section 23 – Assessment timings need to be more precise to the week.
20. Section 23 – Description of the formative portfolio should specify that this is submission of up to 2500 words of the draft portfolio which will be summatively assessed in full later.

Therapeutics

21. Section 20 – Amend sentence 1 to address the missing words.
22. Section 21 – Module outcome 1 is "Summarise the basis for the use of drugs are used in the management of disease states." "Are used" appears to be a typo that should be deleted. The overall statement could also be clearer, if what is intended is that students be able to state the basis for the use of a particular drug in relation to a particular clinical condition. Module outcome 2 could also be clearer, better explaining what is meant by 'categorize (a) rationale'. Is what is intended 'Articulate and defend the rationale'?
23. Section 21 – Learning outcome 1 and 3 don't match those listed in the programme specification 19a.
24. Section 23 – Assessment timings need to be more precise to the week. Resubmission should also be more precise, not ‘*within 4 weeks*’.

Bench to Bedside II

25. Section 22 and 23 – Information about assessment should be consistent in terms of time to be dedicated to it. (The formative appears to require approx. 16 hours throughout the module according to sec. 22, though sec. 23 says weeks 6-8).

26. Section 22 – There is reference to mid-module summative, but sec. 23 summative is listed as end of module. Timings should be precise throughout.
27. Reassessment timing needs to be clearer and precise.
28. Feedback to students should mention formative task feedback.

Research Project/ Dissertation – existing module that has been modified for use on other programmes to the original intention of just MSc HAE

29. Section 8 – timing doesn't match the structure for Pharmacology as in the Programme Specification for part-time students (see 4 above).
30. Section 12, top p.3 – Notes a minimum of 5 hours supervision given, but 'this limit is set to promote autonomy of learning'. It would appear this should be simply '5 hours'. (See also section 22 hours breakdown).
31. Section 21 – Learning outcome 9 is generic, but in the programme specification section 19, p.9 'within pharmacology' is added. The outcomes should be uniformly expressed.
32. Section 23 – Lengths of assessments should be added to the length column of assessment task table.
33. Section 23 – Submission times of assessment need to be more precise and resubmission reference corrected to the right regulation – should be to reg. 13.5. However, consideration should also be given to specifying a more precise resubmission date for all failed dissertations undertaken using this module descriptor.

Recommendations

1. The naming of the 'Bench to Bedside' modules is somewhat inconsistent in that one has a subtitle and no number and two are numbered with no helpful subtitle. Consideration could be given to numbering all or none (I to III) and having subtitles for each. Eg. I: Design and Discovery, II: Trialing, III: Therapeutics.
2. Programme specification Section 13 – references used in designing the programme does not include the BPS published core curriculum that informs learning outcomes on Bench-to-Bedside I (see box 21). A note could be added of how this document has been used, noting that though designed for level 6 curricula it has aided development of the master's.
3. Section 15 PLO b.i could be clearer and pithier, being more explicit about what students are to make a judgement about. Would 'judgements' be better? It would be better if the PLO said more precisely what sort of judgements students would be able to make (about targeting research, developing/selecting candidate drugs, meeting clinical needs, and/or designing and executing trials?)
4. Foundations module – the proposers could reconsider setting the formative MCQ exam as a timed examination, providing the paper as formative task within a less restrictive context.
5. In considering the summative assessment strategy to assess module and programme learning outcomes, consideration could be given to the extent to which oral presentation is a required summative task as frequently as it appears currently. Removing or replacing such a task on one or two modules could make the overall assessment regime more manageable for students without compromising the rigour of the programme.